

SPEECHES

DELIVERED IN THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY OF ONTARIO BY THE HON. GEO. W. ROSS, MINISTER OF EDUCATION, ON MOVING THE SECOND READING OF THE BILLS RESPECTING THE FEDERATION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO WITH OTHER UNIVERSITIES; THE ENDOWMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO, AND THE REORGANIZATION OF UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

12TH APRIL, 1887.

I.—UNIVERSITY FEDERATION.

MR. SPEAKER,—In moving the Second Reading of this Bill, it may not be out of place briefly to refer to the legislation respecting our school system which I have had the honour to submit to this House during the last three years. You will doubtless remember that in the session of 1885, the House was asked to consider bills for amending and consolidating the Public Schools Act and the High Schools Act. In the next session (1886) I asked the House to consider bills for amending and consolidating the Acts respecting Separate Schools, the Art Schools and Mechanics' Institutes. Following the gradation of our system, it is my duty now to ask the House to consider the bill in your hands for improving the status and condition of our Provincial University. Having disposed of this Bill, we will then have dealt with every department of our school system, from its most elementary stages to its completion—from the kindergarten, with its budding perceptions of intellectual life, to the laureated graduate ripened and mellowed by years of honest effort and earnest study.

132149
2513

There is no part of our institutions, civil or political, in which the people of Ontario take so much pride as in their Public Schools. They are peculiarly the product of the best thought of the country, and they are, in the fullest sense of the term, Canadian. Though they partake of many features common to the systems of other countries—notably, the New England and German systems—yet the whole compound, so to speak, has been so moulded and fashioned by the public opinion of our own people, and so adapted to local wants, that it might almost be said to be as purely Canadian as if it had been the exclusive product of Canadian intellect. A glance at a few of its leading characteristics will make this clear. Our Public School system is *essentially a democratic system*. From the rural trustee with jurisdiction over one school and one teacher, to the Minister of Education, with jurisdiction over nearly 6,000 schools and 7,000 teachers, the obligation of responsibility to the people is preserved. The School Act, which is itself but the statutory expression of the popular will, merely classifies the duties of the people in regard to school matters. It makes, in the first place, every *ratepayer* a voter; it next empowers the majority of the ratepayers to elect three persons from among themselves, trustees. These trustees have power to engage teachers, and, under certain conditions, to build school-houses and do all that is necessary for the education of every child between three and twenty-one years of age. There is no reasonable educational want which the trustees have not the power to supply. The measure of the success of any school is limited only by the will of the ratepayers. As the best proof of the liberality and intelligence of that public sentiment which has guided and perfected our school system, it might be worth while to notice the progress made during the last forty years. In 1844 the number of pupils attending the Public Schools of Ontario was 96,756; in 1884 the attendance had risen to 466,917. During the same period, the number of schools had increased from 2,610 to 5,316, and the contributions of the people from \$236,229 to \$3,990,222. Besides these very significant figures, as illustrative of the wonderful progress made in forty years, there are others equally important. Since 1844 we have established two Provincial Normal and Model Schools, fifty-two County Model Schools for training third-class teachers, and sixty-three teachers' institutes for promoting the professional culture

of those engaged in active work. The Separate Schools have also been equally active in their own department, and have risen in excellence and efficiency from year to year.

Nor is the real educational progress less satisfactory than the *statistical*. The *moral and intellectual tone* of each individual school has improved with the progress of the years. There is more earnest study, more quickening of the mind, more thought-arousing teaching, more refinement of manner, more humanizing discipline than we had forty or even twenty years ago. What is most needed now is not amendments to the school law or change of text books, but thorough honest effort on the part of ratepayers, trustees and teachers to secure that steady mental growth, which is never attained except through persistent study and rigid discipline.

And this leads me to the next feature of our school system—that is, its *unity*. The Public School does not, as in England and the United States, stand by itself, as a separate system unrelated to the other schools of the country. By a regular and progressive course of instruction, the Public School leads up to the High School. With the completion of its work, the High School work begins. The graduate of the one, is the freshman of the other—the standard required for leaving the one, is the standard for entering upon the duties of the other. The higher the plane of the Public School the greater will be the breadth and scope of the High School. By this unification our system is made homogeneous. There is neither waste of power in its curriculum, nor of money in its administration. We have realized what Mr. Matthew Arnold pointed out to the British Government as one of the necessities of the English system. “One point urged by me so often and so vainly, ever since my mission abroad in 1859, was the necessity to *organize our secondary instruction*. This is desirable in the interest of our secondary and higher instruction principally but it is desirable, I may say it is indispensable in the interest of our popular instruction also. Everyone now admits that popular instruction is a matter for public institution and supervision; but so long as public institution and supervision stop there, and no contact and correlation are established between our popular instruction and the instruction above it, so long the condition of our popular instruction itself, will and must be unsatisfactory.”

The growth of our High Schools furnishes ample testimony to the place which they hold in the affection of the people. In 1847, previous to which year there are no reports, we had only 32 schools, attended by 1,000 pupils. No further information is reported in 1847, but in 1854, the first year of municipal contribution, there were 65 Grammar Schools, attended by 4,287 pupils, 99 teachers, and an expenditure of \$47,036, of which the people contributed \$11,616. In 1884 we had 106 schools, with 358 teachers, attended by 12,737 pupils, with a total expenditure of \$407,977, of which the people contributed \$288,484. Such a vigorous growth is pretty conclusive evidence that the people of Ontario are not content with an elementary education only.

But while the original design in establishing High Schools, or Grammar Schools, as they were first called, was to prepare for matriculation into the university—it is very gratifying to observe that in recent years, this is but a small part of the service they render to the public. Out of the 12,737 pupils attending in 1884 only 290 matriculated into the university, thus giving evidence of their intention to pursue a university course, subsequently. Of the remainder, 856 left the High School to enter mercantile pursuits, 636 to engage in agriculture, and 639 to enter some one of the learned professions, while 5,237 were pursuing a High School course with a view to engage in teaching. It will thus be seen that the High School, which this House is called upon now and again to support, is not a school for any particular class in the community, but a school whose superior culture is diffused among all classes; and so the merchant, amid the hurry and competition of business, the husbandman, laying bare the broad furrow or reaping the golden harvests, the professional man, amid his labours or his cares, looks upon life with a brighter eye, and upon life's work with a more buoyant spirit, because of the superior culture obtained at the High School. Labour, regarded as menial and debasing, because it possessed one characteristic only, namely, the physical, being united to a broader culture, loses its menial characteristics, and is regarded as a privilege. The narrownesses and prejudices which, unhappily, warp the judgment of so many, become less potent year by year, and with the emancipation of the mind from the thralldom of ignorance, come a higher sense of duty, a more generous public opinion,

and a clearer appreciation of those influences which contribute to the strength and glory of national character.

Having regard to the line of unity, which I laid down a few moments ago as a distinguishing feature of our system, it must follow that the High School should lead to the university. And so it does. What is practically the matriculation examination of our university, is the closing examination of the High School. In this respect also our school system is different from every other system in the world, except the German. In England, as pointed out by Mr. Arnold, there is no connection between the High School, or, more properly speaking, between the secondary schools and the universities. The same state of things exists in the United States. Moreover, it might be said that in many countries, notably in England, secondary education is a matter purely of private enterprise. With us, however, the State extends its kindly guardianship over the education of the people from infancy to manhood, and recognizes no less the powerful stimulus of the university as part of its work, than the elementary school or the kindergarten.

It may be said, however, that superior education is not a necessary part of a State system of education,—that the State discharges its whole duty to the people when it provides the rudiments of a common education. I should be sorry, Mr. Speaker, if this Assembly were so to limit the functions of the State. To do so would be unworthy of that freedom and breadth of view which our school system, as much if not more than anything else, has helped to develop. Is it not true that without the higher education, which it is the peculiar province of the university to foster, we cannot maintain the status of our secondary schools? The great majority of the teachers in our High Schools are graduates either of the Provincial University or of some other university. Is it not true, also, that the school will not rise higher than the master? Then does it not follow, that the success of the whole system of secondary schools depends upon the efficiency of the university; that is to say, if we want to provide for the 13,000 pupils attending our High Schools, a course of instruction that will be stimulating and broadening, we must provide teachers of the highest culture and attainments. But there is more than this at stake. Our Public Schools are attended by nearly half a million pupils. Where are their teachers trained?

Mainly in the High Schools. Over 5,000 are in attendance there now, having this object in view. They, too, will be influenced by the instruction they receive. The work which the university does in fitting them for their duties as teachers in the High School, will therefore extend to the teachers in the Public Schools, and thus every pupil in our elementary schools will feel the effect of that superior education, which it is the object of the bill now before the House to promote. The university is not, therefore, the luxury of the few, it is the necessity of all. The humblest citizen whose child can only be spared from the factory or the workshop for a few years, receives, even in the limited education of that child, some return for the expenditure incurred in university education. Wherever a single child is found conning its simple task, it may be in the remotest portions of the Province, there will be found, in the majority of cases, a teacher guiding its feeble efforts, whose own mind was quickened at some High School presided over by a graduate of some university. This inter-dependence of all parts of our system on each other, while it is one cause of its strength, is also one of the best reasons why this House should improve the university, because, by so doing, it is giving strength and vigor to all the parts.

And now, Mr. Speaker, having, to a certain extent settled the place which the university fills in our school system, it becomes the duty of the House to consider the characteristics of a university that would adequately supply the educational wants, not of its own undergraduates merely, but of the whole Province. And, first, permit me to say, the Provincial University should fitly represent the wealth and resources of this great Province. I need not point out to the House that Ontario has within itself almost the resources of an empire. With an area of over 200,000 square miles, possessing a fertile soil and a salubrious climate ;—its inhabitants representing the dominant races of the globe,—its resources but partially developed, and yet giving promise of unbounded wealth,—the future of the province is bright as a poet's vision or a prophet's dream. You have scarcely entered upon its eastern border, when your eyes are gladdened by evidences of rural comfort which few countries can supply. And if you pursue your journey westerly for 600 miles, the whole route is one ever-widening scene of prosperity. Here it may be a quiet hamlet, sheltered by the "forest primeval," where

"labour with a thousand hands, knocks at the golden gates of morning;" there it is some proud city looking down upon one of our great lakes, to see its factories and spires reflected in the glassy waters. Now you are rushing through the broad expanse of some far-stretching valley, with here and there a glance at farmhouse orchard, or the broad acres of some lordly tiller of the soil. Or, if you pursue your journey northward 600 miles, it is forest and plain, with all their wealth of timber and pasture land. Westward along the great lakes for a distance of 1,000 miles, and still you are within the territory which we claim as our especial heritage, and which we and our children after us will delight to speak of with all the patriotic fervor of Canadians. Should we not, then, in considering the educational forces, which so great a province requires, realize the magnitude of the demand, and build a university which every citizen of Ontario would regard with honest pride as an appropriate representation of the greatness and wealth of the province? If Trajan's arch commanded all the talent and artistic skill of the age to commemorate the subjugation of the enemies of Rome, surely we can afford, in times of peace, fitly to symbolize our love for those forces, more potent than the ambition of the Cæsars, by which we hope to strengthen our country, and make her honoured among the nations of the earth.

Secondly, if our system of education is what we claim it to be, would it be fitting to allow the brand of inferiority, or even of mediocrity, to attach to any portion of it? Our Public Schools have a revenue of nearly \$4,000,000; our High Schools, of \$400,000. By law the resources of the Province, the real and personal property of every citizen, are hypothecated for the support of these schools, and as a result, we have almost unexampled prosperity. Shall it be said that we *compel* success in the one case, but, in the other, by our supineness, jeopardise all? What so worthy of a great nation as great men? And what so worthy of a great system of education as a great university, vigorously managed and officered with men of the deepest culture and learning?

Thirdly, a Provincial University should supply adequately the educational wants even of those seeking exceptional privileges. There should be no necessity for any of our young men to go abroad for instruction in any of the ordinary subjects of a university

curriculum. True, it may not be possible for us for years to come, to equip our laboratories or the physical departments of the university as thoroughly as some of the universities of Germany or the United States are equipped, but we ought to equip them sufficiently for the principal part of a good science course. It may happen, even when well equipped, that the magnetism of a great name—a specialist—will attract some of our ambitious students to go abroad. This we may not be able to prevent, and perhaps should not endeavour to prevent. By all means, let our sons sit at the feet of the Huxleys and the Hamiltons, and the Whatelys, wherever they may be found ; but while so doing, let them not be able to charge their own native country with gross dereliction of duty in regard to the necessities of a good substantial university education.

Fourthly, the university should be so constituted, and its energies so directed, as to be a potent factor in the formation of a national character. For this purpose its chairs should be filled, at any cost, with men of the highest endowments, both natural and acquired. They should not be simply specialists in a technical or scholastic sense, but the *man* should project beyond and above the specialist. The power they possess should not be exercised for the mere purpose of reproducing in their students the equivalent of their own literary attainments, but for the higher end of stimulating them to interrogate nature for themselves. Sir Lyon Playfair's conception of a university is what I would like to see realized in Ontario. He says : " A university fulfilling its purpose to the nation, is, or ought to be, something far higher and more useful than even a combined teaching and degree-conferring institution. It ought to be one of the great intellectual treasuries of the nation, always stored to the full with the richest learning ; it ought, through its educative functions, to be the distributor of that wealth to those who can use it well ; and it ought in itself to be productive and creative of new treasures of science and literature by the researches of its professors.

" A smaller conception than I have given is unworthy of a university in the present age. It is this conception that has made Germany great in the last half-century ; it is the want of that conception which has made France little. You may have teaching institutions, technical schools, examining boards, and institutes for the advance

of science and literature, but not one of these forms a university. Only when they are united by a common organization, mutually supporting each other, each efficient organs of a common body, that the idea of a university is complete, or the possibility of large results attainable."

This being the true conception—the ideal of a university, let us next consider how near we are to its realization, either in educational or financial endowments—and in speaking of the professors now filling chairs in their respective departments of learning, let me not be understood as reflecting in any sense either upon their attainments or usefulness. Few could have discharged with more marked ability the duties of president and professor, than the distinguished *savant*, who for upwards of thirty years has adorned our University with his many varied talents as an executive officer, and as a writer of world wide fame. To him, perhaps more than to any other single person, it has owed its success, and by his steady purpose through times of internal and external agitation it has grown in strength to the present hour. And what is true of him, applies with almost equal force to other members of the staff. But then it must be remembered that there is a limit to the capacity of the ablest of men. It is impossible for one man to discharge the duties of President and fill the chairs of English literature, history and ethnology. In Yale there are three professors in these subjects. Again, in mathematics, astronomy and physics, we have but one professor, two tutors, and two fellows, whereas in Michigan University there are three professors and two tutors assigned for these subjects; in Wisconsin, three professors and two tutors; in California, three professors and three tutors; the same at Cornell and Virginia; and at Yale, five professors and six tutors. In Latin and Greek we have only one professor, one tutor and one fellow, whereas in the same subjects Indiana has two professors and one tutor; Michigan, two professors, two associate professors, and one tutor; and Yale, five professors, one associate professor, and three tutors. Nor is the weakness of the University staff the only objection. There are many subjects of prime importance in a thorough university education, for which no provision is made. For instance there is no chair in political science, or in botany, or in physiology, or in pedagogy. Other departments of science, owing to the inadequacy of the staff,

are grouped. This is the case with zoology, geology, mineralogy and history. It certainly would be in the interests of higher education to subdivide the work in several instances, and thus afford time, not only for the more thorough mastery of each, but also for original research, which as Sir Lyon Playfair has said, is a legitimate part of university work.

And this brings me to consider the resources of the University, for without a stronger financial basis there can be no increase of the staff. The revenue of the University of Toronto, all told, amounts to \$74,000. Of this sum \$63,000 in round numbers is received from rents and interest on investments, and \$11,000 from fees. Compared with the income of some of the universities of the United States, it is a trifling sum. The endowment of Johns Hopkins University amounts to \$3,600,000, and its revenue from all sources to \$240,000; Michigan University has a revenue of \$227,000; Harvard has an endowment of \$4,623,000; Cornell, of \$3,987,000; Columbia, of \$4,680,000. The universities and colleges of the United States have a permanent endowment of \$50,881,000, and an annual revenue of \$5,908,000. Besides the revenue from permanent investments, many of the state universities are liberally aided by their respective state legislatures. The State of Michigan gives annually \$66,000 to the state university; Illinois gives \$23,000; Indiana, \$24,000; Missouri, 127,000; New York, \$143,000; Wisconsin, \$45,000. With such liberal aid as these figures shew, no wonder that some of the American universities are attracting to their halls many of our most active and enterprising students. And yet, notwithstanding our limited resources, much has been accomplished. Already the University of Toronto shews a graduation register of 1,654, of whom 1009 are graduates in arts; 153 of its graduates are engaged in our High Schools, while others fill many of the most influential positions in the country. What could be done with increased financial aid may be anticipated from the following statement of one of its graduates now taking a course at Johns Hopkins University:—"It would not, I think, be going too far to say that the University of Toronto, supported by its hundred and odd High Schools, could without difficulty, if liberally equipped, train students in every department of science and literature as thoroughly in every respect as Johns Hopkins now does—and this too without a post

graduate university. Though the methods of study in some departments and the phases of subjects emphasized in Toronto differ in many respects from the methods and phases emphasized here, still there is even now no very essential difference between the work done in the chief departments in Johns Hopkins and the work required to be done in the same departments in Toronto University; but the Johns Hopkins' staff is almost three times as numerous as the staff of University College. It is astonishing what University College succeeds in doing in the present crippled condition of its staff and equipment, but what it does is rendered possible only by the fact that the High Schools are what they are. When University College is as well prepared to carry out its curriculum of studies as the leading High Schools now are to deal with theirs, we shall have an institution of which all Canadians may well be proud. Until reasonable provision is made for thoroughly efficient undergraduate instruction, it is, of course, idle to plead for the establishment of a post graduate University, though there does not seem to be any reason in the world why the best post graduate University in America should not soon be found in Queen's Park."

With the knowledge of what a university ought to be, of what sister universities have attained to, and of the great need in the interest of our whole system of education of a stronger university in every sense of the word, you may be sure, sir, that as the responsible head of our school system, I could not but feel considerable anxiety as to its future. The existence of other universities, in a certain, but I trust a friendly sense, rivals of the Provincial University, increased my embarrassment. To ask the legislature to render direct aid to the Provincial University would, I found, be met with some opposition. How was the Legislature to be conciliated, or rather, how was this opposition to be overcome? The existence of several theological schools in affiliation with the university furnished me with the hint, that perhaps even some of the outlying universities might be disposed to enter into equally intimate relations with the Provincial University. The friends of Victoria University were also considering the necessity of removing to some more central position. And, so it occurred to me, that possibly a federation of all the universities of Ontario might be brought about--a federation where each would have a common interest in such

departments of university work as involved the most expense, while in the other departments of individual interest, because of their special work, each would still continue to gather around it such students as favoured particular methods of study. In order to carry out this idea, I invited a conference of the heads of all the affiliated colleges and outlying universities, and I was delighted to find that after several days deliberation a scheme was formulated, which I have substantially embodied in the Bill we are now considering. Now I say, Mr. Speaker, that this scheme was framed without, so far as I know, sacrificing any principle which this House has previously sanctioned in the matter of higher education. As a proof of its fairness I may state that, with the exception of Queen's University, it has received the sanction, with a few unimportant modifications, of all the contracting parties.

Well, what are the objections to the scheme?

First. Even if successful, I am asked is it desirable to bring about that uniformity which necessarily follows from its adoption. True education, we are told, consists in the harmonious development of each mind on the line of its own inherent powers. To obtain this requires a variety of methods which are not likely to be obtained in one University.

At first sight this objection seems plausible, but it requires merely a superficial examination of the curriculum of any respectable University to expose its fallacy. There is no University on this continent, or anywhere else so far as I know, that has not in recent years adopted the system of options by which uniformity, in the sense in which it is condemned by the opponents of Federation, is practically impossible.

A degree in Arts is not obtained now, either in Canada or elsewhere, on a *Procrustean* Course of Study. The student with an aptitude for Science or Classics or Modern Languages, follows his bent of mind and receives just as good an education in one or in all of these departments at the same University (providing it is properly equipped), as by attending several Universities. In fact if I were objecting at all to the modern phases of University education, I would say that this system of options has been carried too far; that instead of beginning with Matriculation, as in the University of Toronto and elsewhere, options should not be allowed until a solid

foundation was laid by at least two years' study of well recognized educational subjects. But so far has this principle been carried in some Universities, notably at Harvard, that a Degree in Arts can be obtained without any knowledge of the Classical Languages.

Now, while this practice prevails everywhere, how is uniformity possible? Even before this practice prevailed, when a Course of Study, rigidly uniform, was the rule at Oxford and Cambridge, the product of these Universities bore no invidious stamp of uniformity. On the contrary, each student grew intellectually under the same corps of professors, according to that mental type with which he was primarily endowed. Sunshine and rain—the great sources of life in the vegetable world—produce an infinite variety of plants and shrubs. Why? Because the type does not depend so much upon the external forces as the natural germ. Are not mental characteristics governed by similar laws? Even with one University and one Professor there could be no uniformity, and so we dismiss this objection as unworthy of serious consideration.

But it is said the proposed scheme is designed to centralize the superior education of the Province at one point, and in this way, perhaps not designedly, to deprive other localities of the advantage which they now derive from the existence of a University among them.

I admit, Mr. Speaker, that the local advantages of a University are by no means unimportant, but in the present case it is not a question of locality—it is a question of degree.

✕ If the Province could sustain four or five substantial Universities, at as many judiciously selected points, then I would be delighted to support a system of decentralization; but when the question is, shall we have one University adequately equipped, endowed and officered, fully equal to every reasonable demand for superior education, or shall we have a number of Universities struggling, financially and otherwise, to fulfil the purposes of a University, fully conscious of their inability so to do, then, I say, let us centralize. At all hazards let us have one strong University, fulfilling the conception of Sir Lyon Playfair, already quoted; and if in special lines, either literary or denominational, other Universities find there is work for them to do, let them do it.

I cannot better illustrate my meaning than by quoting the words of Principal Grant, in his inaugural address, delivered in 1877 :—

“As far as provincial action was concerned, it was surely well, it seems to me, that Ontario should devote the whole endowment accruing from the lands set apart for university education to one good college, rather than fritter it away on several institutions. If others are in existence from local, denominational, or other necessities, let the necessity be proved by the sacrifice their friends are willing to make for them, and the real extent of the necessity by the survival of the fittest. The existence of one amply endowed from provincial resources will always be a guarantee that provincial educational interests shall not be sacrificed to the clamours of an endless number of sects and localities, and a guarantee also of the efficiency of the various colleges, the provincial one included.” X

What, then, are the characteristics of the Bill which you are called upon to consider? Its main purpose is clearly set forth in the title, “An Act respecting the Federation of the University of Toronto and University College with other Universities and Colleges.”

It is intended, as may be gathered from the preamble, “that the Universities and Colleges of the Province of Ontario should be permitted to enter into such relations with the University of Toronto as would enable them to avail themselves of the instruction given by the Faculty of the said University.” X

The teaching faculty, formerly confined to University College, is hereafter to be shared with the University, and the Faculties of Law and Medicine, which were abolished as teaching faculties in 1853, are revived.

Any outlying University, on giving notice to the Provincial Secretary of its intention to suspend the power of granting degrees, may, by proclamation in the official gazette, be federated to the Provincial University and thus become entitled to elect representatives to the Senate. While surrendering for the time being the power of granting degrees, it obtains another power, namely, that of a potential voice in the councils of the Provincial University.

The elections to the Senate are hereafter to be triennial, and federating Universities shall possess separate representation for a period of six years.

By this Bill scholarships out of public funds are abolished, and power given the Executive to form regulations for the superannuation of professors.

Without going into detail, these may fairly be said to be the main features of the Bill.

Now, Sir, you may ask, and the House may ask, what is to be gained from this proposed federation? To all appearances but one university—Victoria—is likely to act upon it. Trinity, for the present at all events, will remain as she is. Queen's claims she has ample room in Eastern Ontario for all, and even more than her present resources. Is this scheme proposed for the purpose of crushing or crippling private enterprise, or is it a *bona fide* scheme for raising university education to a higher plane? Mr. Speaker, you will permit me to say, I hope, that so far as I am concerned, so far as the Government is concerned, or even so far as the University of Toronto is concerned, nothing but feelings of the profoundest respect are entertained towards the outlying universities. We have no desire to restrain their laudable efforts in building up their respective institutions. Nay, more, we honour them for their energy and we honour their patrons for their munificence. But, as a Government, charged with Provincial trusts, we cannot, we must not evade the duty of providing for the wants of the institutions committed to our care. This federation bill is our answer to the demand for university education adapted to the wants of the people, whose confidence we now have. And should this bill pass, a great step in advance will have been taken, even if the federation which it proposes, does not for some time to come affect but one university. To the other universities it offers a standing invitation to share in all the endowments of the Provincial University on terms at once liberal and comprehensive. It will be an indication also of that sympathy between the denominational universities and the state university, which, while mutually helpful, leaves the independence of each, secure and intact. It will be a proof that our system of education is homogeneous, and that no jealousy will be allowed to impair its usefulness or efficiency. It will, by the larger endowments and increased teaching facilities which must follow on its passage, be a guarantee to every citizen that this legislature fully appreciates the importance of higher education. With a library

filled with all the best productions of the human intellect, with scientific appliances such as modern wants require, with professors assigned to every department of learning, there will be no necessity to go abroad for a superior education, and no necessity to languish at home because it is denied. All that education can do for a people, this legislature will have provided. The refinement produced by contact with the best minds, the firmness of purpose, the high resolve, the breadth of thought, the depth of patriotism—all that is involved in the education of that most wonderful product of Divine skill—the human intellect—will be the fair heritage which this House will bequeath to posterity as the result of this bill. If Tennyson in his jubilee ode could refer to the reign of Her Gracious Majesty as reflecting

Fifty years of ever-broadening commerce,
Fifty years of ever-brightening science,
Fifty years of ever-widening empire ;

so I believe the future poet and historian of Canada will point to the legislation of this session, as productive of those broadening, brightening, widening influences, educationally, which so happily characterized the reign of England's best and noblest sovereign, in the sense referred to by her illustrious poet laureate.

II.—ON THE SECOND READING OF THE BILL RESPECTING THE ENDOWMENT OF THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO AND UPPER CANADA COLLEGE.

20TH APRIL, 1887.

MR. SPEAKER,—It may be interesting, purely as a matter of historical retrospect, to consider briefly the origin of the present endowments of the University of Toronto and Upper Canada College respectively. Under the Constitutional Act of 1791, the first Parliament of Upper Canada met at the old town of Newark, on the Niagara frontier, on the 17th of September, 1792. This modest Parliament of sixteen members composed, it is said, of "plain, homespun-clad farmers and merchants from the plough and the store," lost no time in giving a thoroughly British tone to the legislation of the country. Of the eight Acts passed at its first session three at least related to the administration of justice according to English precedents, viz., the introduction of English law, trial by jury, and the regulation of the Court of Common Pleas. Other Acts of equal importance were passed in subsequent sessions of the first Parliament, notably an Act for the abolition of the traffic in slaves. It is in the second Parliament, however, that we are particularly interested, as it was to its forethought that we owe much of our present educational prosperity. In 1797 the Legislative Assembly presented an humble Address to His Majesty King George III., asking him to appropriate a certain portion of the wild lands of the Province for the establishment of Grammar Schools and a University for the higher education of the people. The response to this petition was an Imperial Act, setting apart in 1798 467,675 acres in order, as recited in that Act, "to extend the benefits of University education to all members of the various denominations of Christians in the Province of Upper Canada, and to place its government and discipline free from all denominational bias, so that the just rights and privileges of all might be maintained without offence to the religious opinions of any."

Of this area, by the neglect of the authorities, 170,719 acres were alienated for private purposes, but in order that the object for which the original grant was made might not suffer, 272,600 was set aside by order of the Legislative Assembly in 1828, in lieu of the land diverted to private uses. After deducting the usual margin for surveys there remained for educational purposes a total area of 549,217 acres. In 1827 a Royal Charter was granted for the establishment of King's College and 225,944 acres of the lands already mentioned were set apart for its endowment. The remainder was to be distributed among four Grammar Schools which were to be established, viz., one in each of the four districts into which Upper Canada was then divided. The only Grammar School established, however, was the Royal Grammar School at York, better known as Upper Canada College, which obtained as its share 63,268 acres. This was in 1829. Out of this grant grew the present endowment of that institution.

Before proceeding further with the details of the endowment, it might be as well at this point to trace briefly the legislation affecting the educational status of the Provincial University. As already stated King's College was founded by Royal Charter in 1827. It was the pioneer University of Ontario. Queen's was chartered in 1841; Victoria, in 1841; Regiopolis, in 1846; Ottawa, in 1848; Trinity, in 1852; and the Western in 1878.

The Charter granted King's College was modelled after the exclusiveness which then prevailed in England in regard to the special rights and privileges of the Church of England. The President of the College and the members of the College Council must needs be members of the Church of England, and as evidence of their orthodoxy must have subscribed to the Thirty-nine Articles. The Bishop of the Diocese was by law perpetual Chancellor. No religious tests were imposed upon the students, although they were required to attend services at certain times at the College Chapel. In 1834 the denominational character of the College was largely modified by abolishing the ecclesiastical qualifications required by the original Charter for President and members of the Council, but it was not till the late Robert Baldwin's time that the barriers of denominationalism were completely broken down and the College placed on a purely non-sectarian basis. By the Baldwin Act

(1849) the name of the King's College was changed to that of the University of Toronto, a Senate with large powers was created, and a teaching Faculty established in Law and Medicine. The power to grant Degrees in Divinity was abandoned in order to mark its complete separation from the Church. Further modifications in the power of the Senate were made by the Hincks' Act of 1853; the functions of the University were confined to the examination of students for degrees, and University College was created for teaching purposes. The Faculties of Law and Medicine were no longer recognized as teaching faculties. The next change in organization was made by the Crooks' Act of 1873. For the first time, a University bill provided for representation on the Senate of every interest concerned in the success of higher education. The affiliated Colleges were allowed one representative each, the Government was empowered to appoint nine representatives, the graduates were allowed to elect fifteen members, and a few years later the Minister of Education and the High Schools were allowed a voice in its deliberations, and to complete the liberalizing process. In 1884, on a motion by the hon. member from Hamilton (Mr. Gibson), women were admitted on the same terms as students of the opposite sex to all the privileges of the Provincial University.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have given these details of the legislation affecting the University of Toronto for the purpose of shewing the House that in asking for further aid for its maintenance, I am asking aid for an institution as liberal and comprehensive in its management as it is possible for any university to be. Sectarianism has no place at its councils; religious tests of any kind are not required for admission to its halls. Its aim is, not to determine or to perpetuate creeds but to broaden and cultivate those qualities of head and heart which constitute the highest type of citizenship; nor does it ignore religious truth, while working towards this end. The work of each day is begun by invoking the Divine blessing. Its professors are men of the highest character, who assume that their duties can best be discharged by following the curriculum of studies prescribed by the Senate, than by discussing religious dogmas. Socially, too, the University is democratic. Class distinctions, or which students may possibly pride themselves at home, disappear very quickly in the lecture-room. The aristocracy of the

University are the manly and the gifted. Acknowledging the only principle on which a republic of letters can be founded, namely, that of mental superiority, no student pays court to any man except the successful competitor in the common struggle for pre-eminence. To support this University is to support cosmopolitanism in its most exalted, as well as in its most refined form—is to aid in the development of forces, which in their very nature are opposed to disintegration and anarchy.

Having now considered the extent of provincial aid given to higher education by the old Legislative Assembly of Upper Canada, and the scope and purpose of that education which such aid was designed to foster, you will permit me, Sir, I trust, briefly to refer to what the Provincial University has accomplished, so far as statistics can be used to measure work of this kind. King's College was opened in 1843, and continued to be known by that name till 1850. During its short course it conferred in all 104 degrees; of these 40 were the degree of B.A.; 13, M.A.; and 6, M.D. The other degrees were honorary, *ad eundem*, etc. In 1850 the University of King's College was changed in name to the University of Toronto, and in the thirty-six years that followed, under its new name it has granted 1,654 degrees, viz.: 1,009 in Arts, 507 in Medicine, and 138 in Law. If we add to these the 104 granted by King's College, the gross result, in degrees, of the university work of the Province, for which the State has contributed, is 1,758 degrees. Could I but trace as clearly and unerringly the effect of this work upon the life and character of the people of this country, what an argument I would have for university extension? Where is the department of Ontario's busy life into which its influence has not extended? From behind the sacred desk, has it not given solidity and poise to the winged words with which Christian duty has been enforced? At the bar, what cogency of argument, what lucidity of illustration has been furnished through its culture! On the platform, and on the floor of Parliament, wherever man meets his fellow to counsel or dissuade or advise, how many were the words of wisdom, how deep the intensity of earnestness, how overwhelming the eloquence, that owed their birth to the vital force of that solitary state school, which our fathers founded in their poverty, and the rich fruitage of which we are called this

night to consider. Sir, wherever commerce spreads its sail, wherever truth requires an exponent, wherever refinement finds a shrine and manliness an admirer, there you will find a reflection of what, unobtrusively, it may be, but with silent sturdiness the Provincial University has contributed and does contribute to the civilization of this community. To-day 43 of its graduates are themselves teachers and professors in other universities and colleges, and 153 are masters in our High Schools and Collegiate Institutes. One distinguished graduate leads the Liberal party on the floor of the House of Commons, another leads the Conservative party on the floor of this House.

Now, Sir, I suppose the House is ready to ask, What is wanted to increase the efficiency and enhance the usefulness of the University? Are its revenues insufficient for the work to be done, and is the staff too small for the students in attendance? I answer "yes" to this double enquiry—"More money and more men," if we are to possess the land. Let me consider the last named demand first. In *Classics*, we have but one Professor, one Lecturer, and one Fellow; we require at least another Professor, another Lecturer and another Fellow. In German we have now only a Lecturer and a Fellow. This department certainly requires that a Professor should be appointed in addition as soon as possible. French requires a Professor also in addition; Spanish and Italian, together, one Lecturer; English, one Professor and one Lecturer; Pure Mathematics, one Professor; Biology, which includes Botany, Zoology and Physiology, should have two Lecturers; Moral Philosophy, Education and Political Science, each a Professor. This means an addition to the staff of eight Professors and four Lecturers, which, with the present staff of seven Professors, seven Lecturers and seven Fellows, would make a staff of thirty-three in all—nearly doubling the present working capacity of the University.

But to do this, Mr. Speaker, would involve an additional expenditure of \$25,000—no inconsiderable sum. The expenditure of the University last year upon salaries and pensions was \$42,532; on general account, \$30,167. The total revenue from—

Endowment.....	\$63,342
Fees from Students.....	12,152
	<hr/>
	\$75,494

leaving a balance of, say, \$3,000. Assuming that the general expenditure could not be materially reduced, we have to provide the sum already stated, viz., \$25,000.

To meet this demand, I shall ask the House to transfer to the University the whole of the present endowment of Upper Canada, that is, the sum of \$283,163, representing an annual income of \$15,572. By the Bill which I brought down a few days ago, respecting "Federation," it is proposed to withdraw all State scholarships and prizes. This will save, annually, \$4,000. The present site of Upper Canada College on King Street has been appraised at \$325,000. It is proposed by the Bill which I have just placed in your hands, to appropriate \$100,000 of this as a permanent endowment for Upper Canada College; to expend \$120,000, if necessary, on a new building; and \$30,000 on a site and the equipment of the College. This would leave \$75,000 still unexpended. It is further proposed to take of this latter sum \$10,000 for the rearrangement of lecture rooms, etc., in the University, still leaving \$65,000 on hand. If we proceed with the erection of a new Convocation Hall, this surplus would no doubt be reduced to \$20,000, but as the sum of \$20,000 is due the University from the Government on account of the sale of the property in the Park, which was required for Parliament buildings, there would still remain \$40,000 to be added to the permanent endowment of the University. Besides all this, as the Education Department has adopted the Matriculation Examination as its standard for 2nd Class Certificates, and has, consequently undertaken to print the examination papers, there will be saved to the University at least \$1,500 on printing account. Now, summing up these items, we have the following result:—

Endowment of U. C. College.....	\$15,572
Saved on Scholarships and prizes.....	4,000
" on Printing	1,500
Interest at 5% on \$40,000, saved from sale of site of U. C. College.....	2,000
Average surplus of revenue over expenditure for five years	6,300
	<hr/>
Or a total of	\$29,372

to meet an annual increased expenditure of \$25,000. As a financial basis for years to come, I trust this will be found equal to all the reasonable demands of higher education.

I come now to consider the proposed legislation respecting Upper Canada College. From what I have already said, you will be aware that the Government does not intend its abolition. Its present endowment, as well as part of the proceeds of the site go to the University. The remainder will be set apart for building, equipping and endowing the Upper Canada College of the future.

Now, in deciding to retain this School, the Government was influenced by what appeared to them and what they trust will be similarly regarded by the House, as very weighty considerations.

1. It is the *only* non-denominational residential school for boys in the Province, and as such, is useful as a model for other residential schools now in existence, or likely to spring up. Badly conducted residential schools are the most dangerous of all schools. The very aggregation of boys, unless properly disciplined, is fraught with untold evil. Upper Canada College has always maintained a high standard of discipline, and has given an example worthy of imitation.

2. The peculiar training of a well managed residential school is invaluable. Taking the course of study and discipline at Upper Canada College as the basis of what such a course should be, let me notice some of its characteristics:

(a) There is a complete subdivision of labor. This is carried out more fully than at any of our High Schools or Collegiate Institutes, unless it be at one or two of the very best. Now it needs no amplification to make clear to the House the great advantage arising from this to the pupils. With a staff of fifteen teachers, each engaged in teaching that subject which, by early training and long experience, he is found best fitted to teach, there must be a clearness of presentation and a thoroughness not to be obtained in any other way. This is certainly the course pursued in all advanced schools conducted according to modern experience.

(b) There is a thorough classification of the pupils. Every boy is placed where the difficulties with which he has to contend are carefully adjusted to his capacity. There is no place for superficiality, no necessity for discouragement over disappointed effort. The graduation, too, is so easy that a pupil can safely be transferred to

another form, without being overwhelmed with tasks beyond his strength. While on the one hand there is a gentle spur to his ambition in the promotion from time to time of his classmates; on the other hand, there is an occasional warning, in the fate of the tardy and dilatory, that success does not lie along the pathway of negligence and indifference.

(c) Thoroughness of discipline is another characteristic of Upper Canada College; and, let it be remembered, that this discipline is not limited to the ordinary school hours. There, it is discipline in the residence, in the class-room, in the study, and on the school grounds. Its formative influences are being constantly exerted. While not so cramping as to mould and form each boy after any arbitrary model, its tendency, nevertheless, is to prevent the growth of those habits which oppose the highest development of manliness and true character. It is a pervading, more than an active tangible discipline—a force which every boy knows is always present, and which he calculates upon, in connection with recreation, as well as labor.

(d) The mental growth at Upper Canada College is *steady, not forced*. Complaint is sometimes made that there is too great a tendency at our High Schools to exhaust the curriculum of studies as rapidly as possible. What will best enable the pupil to “pass” the stated examination is eagerly sought for, too often by the teacher as well as the pupil. Hence the demand for “notes,” “examination questions,” “interlinear translations,” etc. The curriculum of Upper Canada College is opposed to this haste to “pass.” As in the German Schools, where the pupil’s course is subdivided into annual sections, so the pupils at Upper Canada College are not expected to accomplish more than the allotted task. In this, Mr. Speaker, I see one of its strongest claims for consideration. Even one school in Ontario, so constituted as to be a guide, a model of calm, steady and well regulated mental growth, must be of use educationally. And, when I say this, do not understand me as censuring the masters of our High Schools. I do not censure them, for they are not altogether to blame; they are, to a certain extent, influenced by circumstances beyond their control. The pressure from without—from ambitious students with limited means—from the general rush and roar and crush of business, which in itself

creates a public opinion in favor of high pressure and haste in everything—these circumstances, these surroundings force them, perhaps, unwittingly to sacrifice thoroughness and mental assimilation to the exigencies of the hour. Our watchword, educationally, should be "*Festina lente*," hasten slowly.

(e) *Physical* culture occupies a prominent place in its curriculum. Of this we certainly have not enough, either in our Public or High Schools. Our climate is, I believe, favorable to the growth of the higher types of physical vigor. The conditions of our existence, at all events, are such as to justify its cultivation. Upper Canada College, so far as a school curriculum can do, develops all the powers of the body symmetrically. By the aid of games, gymnastics and military drill, there is ample training of nerve and muscle, not to mention the upbuilding of character, which forms an inseparable constituent of such training. And when to this we add (f) the moral training of the school, we have added all that is necessary to complete an educational type, theoretically, at least of the highest order. These then, are the *internal* or *intrinsic* reasons why we ask the House for its continued support of Upper Canada College.

But beside these, we have excellent and venerable precedents for its continuance. Who that has not heard of Eton, Rugby and Harrow—schools that for centuries supplied England with elements of training and scholarship of incalculable value? Wellington, in speaking of the school boy sports at Eton, said, "That it was there the battle of Waterloo was fought." We may have no such sanguinary conflict here as that which cost England so much blood and treasure, but we have conflicts with the stubborn forces that resist the onward march of civilization, in the shape of ignorance and prejudice that require for their overmastery as much courage and as much tenacity of purpose as was exercised by Royal Guard or war-begrimmed veteran at Waterloo. For that conflict let us do the training, and let us do it well. Let not even one school, with the organization for this work be blotted out.

The testimony of the best and most advanced educators in our own country will sustain us in the maintenance of this school.

Dr. Ryerson said of it in 1869: "I say that if Upper Canada College were made part of the school system, and were placed under the control of a responsible person appointed by public authority

(a Minister of Education), that it would be one wheel in the general machinery of the system."

Dr. McLellan, in his annual report, made the following pertinent references to the work of Upper Canada College: "Ability to pass examinations is not the highest measure of true education: written examinations are valuable as a means, but they are not a satisfactory test of intellectual power and high attainments, while they are no test of the existence of the essential elements which should enter into the formation of a noble manhood. These are developed only by the personal contact and influence of the true teacher upon the scholar, and this is one of the defects of our system of secondary education.

"There are many pupils from eleven to fifteen years of age whose parents desire for them a liberal education, and who must be sent from home to obtain this at some High School. Board and lodging are found by chance during the time the character is being formed, without little or any judicious supervision, and without the influences for good which come from the true educator. A trained intellect and some attainments in Science and Literature will probably be the result, but a stunted growth in the higher elements of his nature. There is need of institutions like Upper Canada College ought to be, where such need may be satisfied, and any arguments against such provision from the State can be advanced with equal force against all Provincial aid and for any secondary education.

"A truly national system of education must meet the needs and requirements of all classes of the community, and ours will fail to secure its highest and best results unless we possess an institution or institutions such as the College might become under a 'Canadian Arnold.'

"Uniformity in a national system is repressive of individuality and the development of genius when carried to an excess. It may therefore be fairly argued that the College should occupy an independent position with more freedom of management and flexibility in its course of study. The chief corrective of the tendency to uniformity is, however, to be found in the influence of the true teacher, with full insight into human nature and a profound sympathy for that of boys, with enthusiasm for his work. Let Upper Canada College be supplied with such, and higher results in national education will be won, with profounder influences upon the moral, intellectual and industrial life of our community.

"These considerations suggest the strongest of all reasons for retaining the College as an integral part of our system."

Such being some of the reasons for its maintenance, let me now endeavour to answer some of the objections urged against its continuance.

1st. It is said that Upper Canada College is privileged as to its income. To a certain extent this is true. Its present endowment, yielding annually the sum of \$15,000, is largely in excess of the guaranteed revenue of any High School or Collegiate Institute, but under the Bill which we are now considering, it is proposed to limit the endowment to \$5,000 a year, or to a sum very little in excess of the legislative and county grants now received by the largest High School. In this connection I might observe that inasmuch as Upper Canada College is not simply a day school, but a residential school as well, the demands upon its staff are necessarily greater, and having regard to the work in all its bearings, it would be nothing more than reasonable that its endowments should be greater also.

2nd. It is said of Upper Canada College, as to its pupils, that only rich men can send their children there, and that its natural tendency is to foster class distinction, utterly inconsistent with the democratic tendency of our school system. In reply to this objection, you will permit me to observe that the present scheme involves a sufficient increase in fees to make the school self-sustaining. If, therefore, those who use the school pay the net cost, or nearly the net cost of its maintenance, I cannot see that any great privilege is conferred upon them. Besides, it must not be forgotten, that those who send their children to Upper Canada College are large tax-payers. If, then, without a murmur they pay their money freely for the support of the Public and High Schools, which they do not use, should we not afford them some facilities for educating their children at their own expense, in conformity with their ideas of what that education should be at a school which they could use? This is all the scheme involves.

3rd. It is said that the school is privileged as to locality; that it is, in fact, a second Collegiate Institute sustained by the Province for the benefit of Toronto. This is partially true, as the school is now constituted. Out of 343 pupils in attendance, 167 are from Toronto. It is designed, however, to make this school almost

exclusively residential. I do not say that we shall absolutely forbid the attendance of day pupils, but what I do say is, they shall not be admitted until after every applicant for residence has been provided for.

4th. It is said that Upper Canada is not part of our school system ; that its work can be done at the High Schools of the Province. Whatever force there may be in these objections, the present Bill will, I trust, remove. We intend to make Upper Canada College a part, and a very important part of our school system. Admission thereto shall be by examination, as in the case of other schools. Its staff must possess the same qualifications as teachers of High Schools and Collegiate Institutes, and the College must be subjected to the same inspection as these latter schools. Its direct connection with the Education Department will thus complete its assimilation with our school system.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it would be invidious for me to discuss the relative merits of Upper Canada College and the High Schools of the Province. It must be evident to every Honourable Member of this House that their spheres of operation are entirely different. If you say that the literary work of the High School pupils is equal to that of the pupils of Upper Canada College, I would not undertake either to refute or argue such a proposition. The *raison d'être* of Upper Canada College is not its literary work or its literary triumphs, but its distinctive residential character. It covers broader ground than any High School can cover ; it deals with the boy, not simply intellectually, but physically and morally, and its aim is more for the formation of character than the mere acquisition of knowledge. That the school does fill a place in our educational system is evident from the increased attendance from year to year. In 1883, the attendance was 243 ; now it is 347, with 39 applications refused from want of room.

I fully realize, sir, that Upper Canada College is at the bar of this House on trial for its life. For sixty years it has done its work with varying efficiency and success, but without for one hour, in that long period, forfeiting the confidence of its patrons or friends.

Within its walls the flickering lamp of classical and scientific learning was first lighted in Ontario by authority of the State. When there was no University to rouse the dormant energies of our sons, Upper Canada College supplied the void, and did it creditably.

When King's College was established in 1843, it supplied its quota of pupils, and from that time to the present hour it has not failed in sending to the Provincial University an earnest band of successful students. Its pupils have graced every position in the gift of the Crown. They are to be found at the bar and in the pulpit. Many of them have made their influence felt in the Legislatures of the country. Some of them from the highest seats of justice, have given signal proofs of their breadth and culture. Two of them have, at different times, occupied Government House with honor to themselves and benefit to the Province over which they presided. Is this the time, then, when we are enlarging our educational borders; when we are emulating, if not excelling, the most advanced nations in the munificence of our contributions to higher education; when we are liberalizing and broadening our whole system—is this the time, I say, to abolish even one school with an individuality of its own and with a record of which Eton or Rugby need not be ashamed? Shall we discredit the judgment of our fathers who laid its foundations in expectation, and who, out of their poverty endowed it so bountifully?

Upper Canada College is not before the bar of this House in *forma pauperis*; it is not appealing to you for aid, it is only asking for a portion of its lawful revenues; it is even willing to be curtailed in its endowment but it is not willing to be cut off as a withered branch. It claims the right to live, and to prove and justify its existence by the continued support which its merits will command.

In making this appeal on its behalf, I am not afraid as to the response. The House that a few nights ago so heartily adopted the Federation Bill; the House that two years ago revised and improved the legislation respecting Public and High Schools; the House that annually votes over \$600,000 a year for educational purposes; the House that provides machinery for raising nearly three and a-half millions more by taxation for similar purposes, will not fail, nay, cannot fail, to recognize in Upper Canada College an educational factor of such surpassing value as to merit its continued confidence and approval.